

Incidentally, while discussing the famous book of William Molyneux—The Case of Ireland's Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated—he sets forth his opinion on colonial self-government.

The doctrine that the parent state has supreme power over the colonies is not only borne out by authority and by precedent, but will appear, when examined, to be in entire accordance with justice and with policy. During the feeble infancy of colonies independence would be pernicious, or rather fatal, to them. Undoubtedly, as they grow stronger and stronger, it will be wise in the home government to be more and more indulgent. No sensible parent deals with a son of twenty in the same way as with a son of ten. Nor will any government not infatuated treat such a province as Canada or Victoria in the way in which it might be proper to treat a little band of emigrants who have just begun to build their huts on a barbarous shore, and to whom the protection of the flag of a great nation is indispensably necessary. Nevertheless, there cannot really be more than one supreme power in a society. If, therefore, a time comes at which the mother country finds it expedient altogether to abdicate her paramount authority over a colony, one of two courses ought to be taken. There ought to be complete incorporation, if such incorporation be possible. If not, there ought to be complete separation. Very few propositions in politics can be so perfectly demonstrated as this, that parliamentary government cannot be carried on by two

really equal and independent parliaments in one empire.¹

This was Macaulay's theory of the relations of the mother country and the colonies and of those of England and Ireland. It is evident that he had no conception of the possibility of a federal system, or of an empire bound together by traditions and feelings and interests rather than by constitutional machinery. For him an incorporating union

¹ VI, 2773 (xxiii).